EXHIBIT D

```
Page 1
 1
               UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
 2
               SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK
 3
 4
 5
     FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION
     and THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE )
     OF NEW YORK, by LETITIA
 6
                                    Case Number:
     JAMES, Attorney General of
 7
     the State of New York,
                                      1:17-cv-00124-LLS
 8
            Plaintiffs,
 9
     vs.
10
     QUINCY BIOSCIENCE HOLDING
     COMPANY, INC., a
11
     corporation, et al.
            Defendants.
12
13
14
15
               DEPOSITION OF ROSEMARY ROSSO
16
                  As 30(b)(6) Designee of
17
                 FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION
18
                    (Via videoconference)
19
                      January 29, 2021
20
21
22
23
24
     Reported by: John L. Harmonson, RPR
25
     Job No. 188886
```

Page 28

1 R. ROSSO

- 2 A. The FTC would make a calculation as to
- 3 what the injuries to consumers is, which is the
- 4 net sales, as I discussed.
- 5 O. So it would make the same calculation
- 6 with respect to each of the different categories
- 7 of relief identified in the prayer for relief in
- 8 the FTC's complaint?
- 9 A. The primary remedy is redress to
- 10 consumers. And so the injury calculation is the
- 11 calculation of gross sales minus refunds.
- 12 Q. Okay. You keep categorizing the
- 13 primary relief as redress to consumers. But the
- 14 FTC's complaint delineates various categories of
- 15 relief. And so what I'm trying to understand is
- 16 if there is any difference between those
- 17 categories of relief identified in the complaint.
- 18 A. And the reason why I keep going back
- 19 is because the way that the prayer for relief is
- 20 written and what it says is that the relief is
- 21 the relief that the court finds necessary to
- 22 redress injuries to consumers, which is the core
- 23 equitable remedy. And then it mentions
- 24 additional things.
- 25 So the starting point for any monetary

Page 29
R. ROSSO

- 2 remedy is the net sales of the Prevagen products
- 3 at issue in the litigation.
- 4 Q. But as you say, the complaint does
- 5 mention these other things. And I'm trying to
- 6 understand if the FTC's calculation of monetary
- 7 relief would change based on the various
- 8 different theories of relief that are identified
- 9 in the complaint.
- 10 A. No. The monetary remedies that the
- 11 FTC would calculate would be the net sales to
- 12 consumers. That would be the injury.
- 13 Q. So regardless of whether the request
- 14 to the trial court is based in disgorgement,
- 15 restitution, consumer redress, or any of the
- other theories identified in the complaint, the
- 17 monetary amount would be the same; is that
- 18 correct?
- 19 A. The monetary remedies that the FTC
- 20 would calculate would be the calculation of the
- 21 injury to consumers. All of the monetary
- 22 remedies would be based on that.
- To the extent that the defendants have
- 24 arguments that there should be offsets, I believe
- 25 that in some cases courts have permitted the

Page 73 1 R. ROSSO I am aware of consumers who filed Α. complaints with the FTC, and the complaints were 3 turned over to the defendants through discovery. 4 And is it your position -- is it the 5 0. FTC's position that every single consumer who 6 7 purchased Prevagen was harmed? Α. Yes. 8 9 And your response to Interrogatory Q. 10 7 specifically mentions economic injury. 11 Is the FTC alleging any other type of injury in this action against consumers? 12 13 Α. The monetary remedy is economic So that is the primary remedy being 14 injury. 15 sought. 16 You know, in dietary supplement cases, did any consumer forego any treatment or 17 anything? But the remedies that we are seeking 18 19 and the case that we are making is economic 20 injury. 21 Can you explain what you mean when you 0. 22 mention "foregoing treatment"? 23 Again, I'm talking generally in some Α. 24 cases, and not this case in particular, but there

are cases where there is a concern that there

25